Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Civil and Mechanical Systems (1205).

Date and Time: January 18, 1995, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: NSF, Room 580, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Contact: Dr. John B. Scalzi, Program Director, 703–306–1361.

Type of meeting: Closed.

Purpose of meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning support for research proposals submitted to the NSF for financial research.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552 b. (c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: December 28, 1994.

Linda Allen-Benton,

Deputy Director, HRM.

[FR Doc. 94–32326 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Special Emphasis Panel in Engineering Education and Centers—Notice of Meeting

In accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Engineering Education and Centers (173).

Date/Time: January 18, 1995, 8:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Conference Room 365.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Sharon Middledorf and Mary Poats, Engineering Education and Centers Division, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Rm 585, Arlington, VA 22230, (703) 306–1384.

Purpose of Meeting: To carry out Committee of Visitors (COV) review, including examination of decisions on proposals, reviewer comments, and other privileged materials.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Committee is reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they were discussed. If discussions were to open to the public, these matters that are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act would be improperly disclosed.

Dated: December 28, 1994.

Linda Allen-Benton,

Deputy Director, HRM.

[FR Doc. 94–32327 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Special Emphasis Panel in Geosciences; Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

Name and Committee Code: Special Emphasis Panel in Geosciences (1756).

Date and Time: January 17–18, 1995; 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: Room 730, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Jarvis L. Moyers (703) 306–1522 and Dr. Sherry O. Farwell (703) 306–1522, Program Directors Division of Atmospheric Sciences, Room 775, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate Aerosol Characterization Experiment (ACE–1) proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a propretary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 USC 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: December 28, 1994.

Linda Allen-Benton,

Deputy Director, HRM.

[FR Doc. 94–32329 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Proposed Availability of FY 95 Funds for Financial Assistance (Grants) To Support Research at Educational Institutions and the Exchange of Information

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, announces proposed availability of Fiscal Year (FY) 95 funds to support a limited number of research grants to educational institutions. These funds may also be used to support professional meetings and conferences for the exchange and transfer of research concepts and findings related to the safety of nuclear power production.

The FY 95 ceiling for research grants to educational institutions is approximately $1,050,000.00. Of this amount, approximately $456,000.00 will be available for new grants. Because of this limitation, proposed grant budgets should be restricted to about $50,000.00 per year, with total project funding not exceeding $100,000.00 over a two-year period. Proposals for new FY 95 research grants should be submitted between the date of this Notice and February 17, 1995. Proposals received after February 17, 1995 will be considered for FY 95 funding to the extent practicable.

ADDRESS: Nuclear Regulatory Commission. ATTN: Grants Officer, Mail Stop T–7–I–2 Division of Contracts, Office of Administration, Washington, DC, 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shirley Crampton on (301) 415–6589 or Mary Mace on (301) 415–7314.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On March 17, 1994, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published in the **Federal Register** a notice that announced the proposed availability of FY 94 funds for the NRC Grant Program. The NRC is revising that notice to provide information on their grant program for FY 95.

Scope and Purpose of This Announcement

Pursuant to Section 31.a and 141.b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the NRC's Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research proposes to support educational institutions, nonprofit entities, state and local governments, and professional societies through providing funds for expansion, exchange and transfer of knowledge, ideas, and concepts directed toward the NRC safety research program. The program includes, but is not limited to, support of professional meetings and conferences. In addition, the NRC has a limited amount for research grants to educational institutions (see topics below). The FY 95 ceiling for these grants is approximately $1,050,000.00 with approximately $456,000.00 of this amount available for new grants.

The purpose of this program is to stimulate research to provide a technological base for the safety assessment of system and subsystem technologies used in nuclear power applications. The results of this program will be to increase public understanding relating to nuclear safety, to pool the funds of theoretical and practical knowledge and technical information, and ultimately to enhance the protection of the public health and

safety. In addition, each grant to an educational institution should contain elements which will potentially benefit the graduate research program of the institution, e.g., graduate student training.

The NRC encourages educational institutions to submit research grant proposals in the following areas:

1. Experiments and predictive modeling for thermal stratification, thermal striping and flow-induced vibration in plant fluid systems.

2. Evaluation, modeling, and experiments on phenomena associated with the cooling of molten debris in a reactor vessel lower head and associated lower head failure analyses during a severe accident.

3. Modeling and experimentation on two-phase flow, interfacial relations, and heat transfer in reactor coolant systems. Experiments in modeling of passive heat transfer in natural circulation systems.

4. Development of condensation models for systems codes such as RELAP5/MOD3 or TRAC—PFI/MOD2 for two cases: with and without condensible gases.

5. Conduct experimentation and model development of the boron in reactor coolant systems under natural circulation conditions.

6. Development and validation of a standard model of human performance in (a) nuclear power plant operations and maintenance, (b) medical uses of by-product materials, and (c) industrial uses of by-product materials.

7. Effect of digital I&C technology on operator performance, including vigilance, response rate, response accuracy, and completeness.

8. Develop and codify pragmatic, statistically valid methods for updating severe accident frequency and consequence analysis to reflect results of new operational, experimental and calculation data.

9. Develop methods and comparison of probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) results with operational data and experience.

10. Evaluation and modelling of microstructural and chemistry changes in grain boundaries of irradiated austenitic materials.

11. Development of nondestructive testing methods for in-situ evaluation of reactor vessel material properties and property degradation due to aging, such as fracture toughness, fatigue, residual life, and radiation effects.

12. Determine data requirements to assess system reliability performance to a prescribed goal at a predetermined assurance level.

13. Development of innovative methods for accurate imaging of flaws in thin wall, small diameter tubes.

14. Development of non-intrusive, in-situ condition monitoring and diagnostic methods for detecting and evaluating degradation of electrical insulation materials.

15. Development of methods for predicting and measuring electrochemistry and chemistry in crevices and cracks.

16. Development of and/or validation of models to predict the propagation of seismic ground motion in Central and Eastern United States including the effects of ground motions on the response of NPPs and their site characteristics, taking into consideration uncertainties inherent in such estimates.

17. Development and/or validation of models to explain the quaternary tectonics and seismicity of the Central and Eastern United States (East of 105 degrees W).

18. Development of techniques and QA and QC procedures necessary for rapid bioassay analysis in the event of accidental internal exposure.

19. Studies of volcanism or other disruptive processes or events in the Basin and Range.

20. Development of improved instrumentation or techniques for measuring activity, radiation dose, and dose rates, especially from small radioactive particles, and materials in the environment in concentrations approaching background.

21. Research on the metabolism of radionuclides and their compounds relative to the calculation of internal dose.

22. Validation of approaches to quantitatively assess human health effects of radiation, including new approaches to analyses of human epidemiological studies and experimental animal studies, and investigation of radiation induced effects at the cellular/molecular levels and repairs thereof.

23. Development of, or analysis of the effectiveness of decontamination technologies for land, structures, recycled materials and equipment and estimation of individual comparative costs.

24. Investigations, including natural analogue studies for long-term analyses, of coupling between hydrologic, thermal, chemical, and/or mechanical processes as they affect the simulation of high-level waste repository performance.

25. Development of methods needed for realization of risk-based regulation.

Eligible Applicants

Educational institutions, nonprofit entities, State and Local governments, and professional societies are eligible to apply for a grant under this announcement.

Factors Generally Indicating Support Through Grants

The NRC's benefit from the results of grants should be no greater than for other interested parties, i.e., the public must be the primary beneficiary of the work performed. Surveys, studies, or research which provide specific information or data necessary for the NRC to exercise its regulatory or research mission responsibilities will not be funded by a grant. Applicants requesting support for work which has a direct regulatory application should submit their requests as an unsolicited proposal for consideration as a contract rather than a grant.

1. The primary purpose of NRC grants is to support the development of knowledge or understanding of the subject or phenomena under study.

2. The exact course of the work and its outcome are usually not defined precisely, and specific points in time for achievement of significant results need not be specified.

3. The NRC desires that the nature of the proposed investigation be such that the recipient will bear prime responsibility for the conduct of the research and exercise judgment and original thought toward attaining the scientific goals within broad parameters of the proposed research areas and the resources provided.

4. Meaningful technical reports (as distinguished from Semi-Annual Status Reports) can be prepared only as new findings are made, rather than on a predetermined time schedule.

5. Simplicity and economy in execution and administration are mutually desirable.

Proposal Format

Proposals should be concise and provide a thorough understanding of the proposed project. Neither unduly elaborate applications nor voluminous supporting documentation is desired.

State and local governments shall submit proposals utilizing the standard forms specified in Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–102 (Revised), Paragraph 6.c). Nonprofit organizations, universities, and professional societies shall submit proposals utilizing the standard forms stipulated in OMB Circular A–110, (Attachment M).

The format used for project proposals should give a clear presentation of the

proposed project and its relation to the specific objectives contained in this notice. Each proposal should follow the format outlined below unless the NRC specifically authorizes exception.

1. *Cover Page.* The Cover Page should be typed according to the following format (submit separate cover pages if the proposal is multi-institutional):

Title of proposal.—To include the term ''research,'' ''study,'' ''conference,'' ''symposium,'' ''workshop,'' or other similar designation to assist in the identification of the project;

Location and Dates for Conferences, Symposium, Workshop, etc.;
Names of Principal Researchers or Participants;
Total cost of Proposal; (Identify Cost by Fiscal Year)
Period of Proposal;
Organization or Institution and Department;
Required Signatures:
Principal Participants:
Name: _____
Date: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone No.: _____
Required Organization Approval:
Name: _____
Date: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone No.: _____
Organization Financial Officer:
Name: _____
Date: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone No.: _____

2. *Project Description.* Each proposal shall provide, in ten pages or less, a complete and accurate description of the proposed project. This section should provide the basic information to be used in evaluating the proposal to determine its priority for funding. Applicants must identify other possible sources of financial support for a particular project, and list those sources from which financial support has been or will be requested.

The information provided in this section must be brief and specific. Detailed background information may be included as supporting documentation to the proposal.

The following format shall be used for the project description:

(a) *Project Goals and Objectives.* The project's objectives must be clearly and unambiguously stated. The proposal should justify the project including the problems it intends to clarify and the development it may stimulate.

(b) *Project Outline.* The proposal should show the project format and agenda, including a list of principal areas of topics to be addressed.

(c) *Project Benefits.* The proposal should indicate the direct and indirect benefits that the project seeks to achieve and to whom these benefits will accrue.

(d) *Project Management.* The proposal should describe the physical facilities required for the conduct of project. Further, the proposal should include brief biographical sketches of individuals responsible for planning the project.

(e) *Project Costs.* Nonprofit organization shall adhere to the cost principles set forth in OMB Circular A–122. Educational institutions shall adhere to the cost principles set forth in OMB Circular A–21, and state and local government shall adhere to the cost principles set forth in OMB Circular A–87.

The proposal must provide a detailed schedule of project costs, identifying in particular—

(1) *Salaries*—in proportion to the time or effort directly related to the projects;

(2) Equipment (rental only):

(3) Travel and Per Diem/Subsistence in relation to the project;

(4) Publication Costs;

(5) Other Direct Costs (Specify)—e.g., supplies or registration fees; Note—Dues to organizations, federations or societies, exclusive of registration fees, are not allowed as a charge.

(6) Indirect Costs (attached negotiated agreement/cost allocation plan); and

(7) *Supporting Documentation.* The supporting documentation should contain any additional information that will strengthen the proposal.

Proposal Submission and Deadline

This notice is valid for Federal Government Fiscal Year 95 (October 1, 1994 to September 30, 1995). Potential grantees are advised, however, that due to the limited funding available for new research grants to educational institutions, such proposals received after February 17, 1995 will be considered for FY95 funding to the extent practicable.

Funds

For Fiscal Year 95, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, anticipates making a total of approximately $1,050,000.00 available for funding research grants to educational institutions. Of this amount, approximately $456,000.00 will be available for new research grants in FY95. Because of this limitation, proposed grant budgets should be restricted to about $50,000.00 per year, with total project funding not exceeding $100,000.00 over a period of two years.

Evaluation Process

All proposals received as a result of this announcement will be evaluated by an NRC review panel.

Evaluation Criteria

The award of NRC grants is discretionary. Generally, projects are supported in order of merit to the extent permitted by available funds.

Evaluation of proposals for research projects will employ the following criteria. No level of importance is implied by the order in which these criteria are listed.

1. Adequacy of the research design.
2. Scientific significance of proposal.
3. Technical adequacy of the investigators and their institutional
4. Relevance to a research area(s) described above.
5. Reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to the work to be performed and anticipated result.
6. Potential benefit of the project to the overall benefit of the institution's graduate research program.

Evaluation of proposals for professional meetings, conferences, symposia, etc. will employ the following criteria:

1. Potential usefulness of the proposed project for the advancement of scientific knowledge.
2. Clarity of statement of objectives, methods, and anticipated results.
3. Range of issues covered by the meeting agenda.
4. Qualifications and experience of project speakers.
5. Reasonableness of estimated cost in relation to anticipated results.

Disposition of Proposals

Notification of award will be made by the Grants Officer, and organizations whose proposals are unsuccessful will be so advised.

Proposal Instructions and Forms

Questions concerning the preceding information, copies of application forms, and applicable regulations shall be obtained from or submitted to (Grant applications packages, Standard Form 424, must be requested in writing): U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grants Officer, Division of Contracts, Mail Stop T–712, Office of Administration, Washington, D.C. 20555.

The address for hand-carried applications is: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grants Officer, Division of Contracts, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–7I2, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Md. 20852.

Note: Upon delivery of the application to the NRC guard desk (at the above address),

the guard should be requested to telephone the Division of Contracts (415–7314) for pick-up of the application.

Nothing in this solicitation should be construed as committing the NRC to dividing available funds among all qualified applicants.

Dated Rockville, MD this 20th day of December, 1994.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mary Mace,

3Grants Officer, Division of Contracts, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 94–32301 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–295 and 50–304]

Commonwealth Edison Company, Zion Nuclear Power Station, Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by a letter dated November 3, 1994, and a signed petition, Robert K. Rutherford and other Zion Nuclear Power Station security guards (Petitioners) request that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to the new response team member (RTM) security plan at Zion Nuclear Power Station.

Petitioners request that the NRC reassess and withdraw its approval of the new RTM security plan and require greater justification from both the licensee and the security contractor about reduction of armed guards and the defense of the plant to what Petitioners characterize as a minimum state of operational readiness. As bases for the request, Petitioners assert that the new RTM security plan degrades actual plant security; that the proposed qualifications in the plan are causing employee turnover, undue stress, labor problems, and inconsistency in plant defense; that monetary considerations should not take priority over plant defense and administrative jobs should not replace front-line security guards; that the total disarming of the Zion owner-controlled area and the Zion-protected area is highly detrimental to plant defense and public safety; and that modern armaments and increased hostility among the general public as well as terrorist threats from either domestic and/or international sources have not abated.

The letter and enclosed petition are being treated as a Petition pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation (NRR). As provided by 10 CFR 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on the Petition within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of December 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94–32302 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc.; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated November 21, 1994, Paul M. Blanch (Petitioner) has requested that the NRC take ''prompt'' action with regard to Rosemount Nuclear Instruments, Inc. Specifically, the Petitioner requests that: (1) Rosemount ''immediately'' inform all users of safety related transmitters pursuant to Part 21 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 21) of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and that the oil may crystallize if the transmitters are exposed to temperatures of less than 70 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), and provide all available information to each licensee for evaluation as applicable to each facility; (2) the NRC take ''prompt and vigorous'' enforcement against Rosemount for both its failure to report to users of the transmitters the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and its failure to report the potential of the oil to crystallize when exposed to temperatures of less than 70 °F, and that a ''separate violation must be issued'' for each defect and each day of failure to provide the required notice; and (3) the NRC consider escalated enforcement action due to the repetitive nature of these violations. As a basis for his request, the Petitioner asserts that, contrary to 10 CFR Part 21, although Rosemount was aware of a defect that may create a substantial safety hazard, it failed to report this defect to the affected licensees within five working days for evaluation. Specifically, the Petitioner alleged that, although the NRC informed Rosemount by letter dated June 2, 1994, that the fill oil did not meet the specified performance requirements to assure operability of transmitters under normal operating conditions in that crystallization may occur when the transmitters are subjected to temperatures of less than 70 °F, which may inhibit the operation of many transmitters, Rosemount withheld this information from licensees. The Petitioner asserts further that this is a ''repetitive'' violation in that on November 15, 1994, the NRC assessed a Severity Level II violation against Rosemount for failing to properly inform licensees of a potential for a sensor cell oil-loss problem in violation of 10 CFR 21.21.

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. The request that Rosemount ''immediately'' inform all users of safety related transmitters of the shelf life limitations of the fill oil and the potential for crystallization has been denied. As provided by Section 2.206, action will be taken on the Petitioner's remaining requests within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of December, 1994.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 94–32303 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–298]

Nebraska Public Power District; Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–46, issued to the Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee) for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

The proposed amendment is a Line Item Technical Specifications Improvement and would revise the CNS Technical Specifications, definition 1.0.J. concerning entering an operational condition consistent with the wording proposed in NRC Generic Letter 87–09, ''Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements,'' dated June 4, 1987.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended